

# OGC Has Reviewed

Approved For Release 2001/10/30 : CIA-RDP57-00384R000400180022-7

LS-1932  
Subject  
322  
1952

DD/P, Chief, ADMIN

19 November 1952

Office of the General Counsel

25X1A

Relief for [REDACTED]

REFERENCE: Memorandum from Chief, NE to DD/A dated 17 November 1952, subject as above.

25X1A

1. The referenced memorandum requests the approval of the DD/A of a lump-sum payment in the amount of \$450. to [REDACTED] to compensate him for the financial hardship resulting from the separate maintenance of his dependents overseas, without the benefit of overseas allowances, while he was ordered to Washington on TDY. This approval is sought under the authority of Confidential Funds Regulation [REDACTED]

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

2. [REDACTED] was originally ordered to Washington from [REDACTED] PCS, departing with his dependents on 24 August 1952. His overseas allowances were discontinued on that date. The understanding at the time was that his project was to be terminated. His wife and child accompanied him as far as Rome where they elected to remain with relatives pending receipt by [REDACTED] of new instructions from CIA.

25X1A

25X1A

3. Upon his arrival in Washington, the project with which [REDACTED] had been associated was revived and decision was made to return him to [REDACTED] after an appropriate instructional period here. Accordingly, his travel orders were amended to change his status in Washington to TDY for approximately ninety days. Since his dependents had already proceeded to [REDACTED] the expense of their travel and return to [REDACTED] was authorized on the TDY orders for cover reasons as an expense of operations.

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

4. Although in retrospect, it might seem that [REDACTED] family should have remained in [REDACTED] while he was brought to Washington on TDY, the referenced memorandum states that this would have been operationally unsuitable because the intention then was that he not return to [REDACTED] under the existing cover arrangements. He was instructed to so advise his commercial and social contacts. [REDACTED] dependents would have been authorized travel to Washington on his original PCS orders. Their election to remain in [REDACTED] with relatives was a personal convenience, but nonetheless resulted in a considerable saving to the Government. As soon as his orders were amended to TDY, his dependents would not be authorized further travel under normal Government rules and cover requirements would not then have justified resort to extraordinary authority. [REDACTED] therefore, was prevented from bringing his family to Washington and at the same time suffered deprivation of his normal overseas allowances. The referenced memorandum states that

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

cover requirements would have precluded advance return of his dependents to [REDACTED]. Seemingly, if advance return had been possible, overseas allowances would have been resumed on arrival. Although his dependents were staying for a portion of the time with relatives, he is reminded of the adage that "relatives, like fish, are no good after three days" and recognize the necessity that [REDACTED] bear the major burden of his dependents support while in [REDACTED]

25X1A

25X1A

5. On the facts as stated, this office can perceive no legal objection to the reimbursement of [REDACTED] in the manner and to the extent that the referenced memorandum recommends. His financial hardship clearly derives from cover requirements of this Agency.

25X1A

25X1A  
[REDACTED]

Attachment

OOO/GHK:iam

Distribution -

Orig - Addressee  
4 - OOO

# MISSING PAGE

ORIGINAL DOCUMENT MISSING PAGE(S):

ATTACHMENT

17 Nov 52 memo Not Forwarded